

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 and 6-7 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner's position is that the specification is enabling for interferometric device including a laser. The limitation of claim 5 has been added in claim 1. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn. The term "laser" means "Any of several devices that emit highly amplified and coherent radiation of one or more discrete frequencies." See *American Heritage Dictionary* at <http://education.yahoo.com/reference/dictionary/entry/laser>.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected as being anticipated by Sakai '149 or Sakai '048. These rejections are respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn as claim 1 includes the limitation of claim 7.

Claims 1, 2 and 4-7 were rejected as being obvious over Sakai '149 in view of Funato. Claims 1-7 were rejected as being obvious over Sakai '149 in view of Anderson. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Sakai '149 fails to disclose the limitation of original claim 7, namely, "wherein the master has a feature having a size of less than 0.35 micron and a standard deviation of a period of the feature of less than 1 nm." The secondary references, namely, Funato and Anderson also fail to disclose this limitation. In fact, as explained in paragraph [0052] of the specification, prior to this invention, the prior art "photolithography methods result in a feature size of more than 0.35 microns." In short, prior to his invention, irrespective of any combination of prior art references, one would not have arrived at this invention.

By *unexpected results*, this invention has provided a solution to a *long-felt need* to create a photolithography method that results in a feature size of less than 0.35 microns. The unexpected results were possible by the use of a mask with an arc-shaped slit. There is no disclosure of an arc-shaped slit recited in claim 4 in the cited prior art references.

In short the obviousness rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons:

(1) The prior art as a whole fails to disclose "wherein the master has a feature having a size of less than 0.35 micron and a standard deviation of a period of the feature of less than 1 nm."

(2) Applicants has solved a long-felt need to create a photolithography method that results in a feature size of less than 0.35 microns.

(3) Applicants have demonstrated unexpected results by being able to create a master having a feature having a size of less than 0.35 micron and a standard deviation of a period of the feature of less than 1 nm.

In light of the above, the pending rejections should be withdrawn.

In the event that the transmittal form is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, Applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing 146712004300.

Dated: September 6, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Raj S. Dave

Registration No.: 42,465
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300
McLean, Virginia 22102
(703) 760-7755